

Serial No. 10/810,891

December 2, 2005

Reply to the Office Action dated July 11, 2005

Page 8 of 13

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet of Drawings include new Fig. 7.

Attachment: One (1) New Sheet.

Serial No. 10/810,891  
December 2, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated July 11, 2005  
Page 9 of 13

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1-6, 8-11, 13 and 14, and add new claims 16-18.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 11, 12, 14 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have added new claim 18 which corresponds to claim 11 rewritten in independent form including all of the features of claim 1 and intervening claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is allowable.

The drawings were objected to for allegedly failing to show the features recited in originally filed claim 5. Applicants have added a new figure (Fig. 7) which shows the features recited in originally filed claim 5. In addition, Applicants have amended the Brief Description of the Drawings and the Detailed Description of Preferred Embodiments of the originally filed specification so as to describe new Fig. 7. Applicants' undersigned attorney declares that new Fig. 7 and the amended portions of the Brief Description of the Drawings and the Detailed Description of Preferred Embodiments do not contain any new matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 1-10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Garcia et al. (U.S. 5,842,579). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1-10 and 13.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

An electronic-component conveying device comprising:  
a conveying plate which moves in one conveying direction  
and includes a plurality of component-holders arranged at a  
predetermined pitch along the conveying direction;  
at least one component-container containing a plurality of  
electronic components for supplying the components to at least one of the  
plurality of component-holders, the plurality of electronic components  
being held by the plurality of component-holders while being conveyed by  
the conveying plate;

Serial No. 10/810,891  
December 2, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated July 11, 2005  
Page 10 of 13

a component-detecting unit for detecting the presence of the plurality of electronic components in the plurality of component-holders; and

a component-feeding unit for feeding additional electronic components to each of the component-containers based on the detection of the presence of the plurality of electronic components; wherein

**each of the plurality of component-holders holds only a single electronic component of the plurality of electronic components; and**

**the component-detecting unit detects the presence of the single electronic component held in each of respective ones of the plurality of component-holders. (emphasis added)**

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicants' claim 1, including the features of "each of the plurality of component-holders holds only a single electronic component of the plurality of electronic components" and "the component-detecting unit detects the presence of the single electronic component held in each of respective ones of the plurality of component-holders," Applicants have been able to provide an electronic component conveying device which ensures supplying of the electronic components to the conveying plate to prevent lowering of operational efficiency and which minimizes the difference in the number of electronic components among the component-containers to prevent lowering of the rate of operation (see, for example, the first full paragraph on page 3 of the originally filed specification).

The Examiner alleged that Garcia et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Applicants' claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of "each of the plurality of component-holders holds only a single electronic component of the plurality of electronic components" and "the component-detecting unit detects the presence of the single electronic component held in each of respective ones of the plurality of component-holders."

In contrast to Applicants' claim 1, as clearly seen in Fig. 10a of Garcia et al., the component sensors 130 of Garcia et al., which the Examiner alleged correspond to the component detecting unit recited in Applicants' claim 1, detect only a size or a volume

Serial No. 10/810,891  
December 2, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated July 11, 2005  
Page 11 of 13

of a group of electronic components 12 which are disposed in a component-container 110. The component sensors 130 of Garcia et al. clearly do not detect the presence of a single component in a component holder of a conveying plate. The component sensors 130 of Garcia et al. are completely incapable of detecting the presence of a single component in a component holder of a conveying plate because the sensors are not disposed adjacent to a component holder of a conveying plate but rather are disposed in the component-container 110. In fact, Garcia et al. fails to teach or suggest any detecting unit which is capable of detecting the presence of a single electronic component in a component-holder of a conveying plate.

Thus, Garcia et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the features of "each of the plurality of component-holders holds only a single electronic component of the plurality of electronic components" and "the component-detecting unit detects the presence of the single electronic component held in each of respective ones of the plurality of component-holders" as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Garcia et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 18 are allowable. Claims 2-17 depend upon claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a Two-month extension of time, extending to December 11, 2005, the period for response to the Office Action dated July 11, 2005.

Serial No. 10/810,891  
December 2, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated July 11, 2005  
Page 12 of 13

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 2, 2005

  
Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850  
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102  
Telephone: (703) 637-1480  
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499